



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

part of France that she be protected along the Rhine, a very visible stumbling-block confronting any conference concerned with the problem of land armaments. One is led to suppose that the United States Government considers the limitation of naval armaments as of more importance than the limitation of land armaments, for the reason that it places the former at the head of its agenda. But whether naval armaments or land armaments constitute a greater threat to the peace of the world is a matter that has not been discussed, so far as we know. There remains always the problem of keeping the seas free and open in time of war, a problem which England refused even to discuss in Paris. Will she discuss it here?

In the government's agenda questions of policy are put last. We feel sure that both Mr. Harding and Mr. Hughes fully realize that questions of policy must come first, if any adequate result is to grow out of the proceedings. As we have tried to show, a reduction only in terms of money, except for the tax-payer, can be of little significance. We are confronted with a situation in morals.

Much as we are inclined to mistrust formulas, this conference must end in formulas mutually acceptable. French fears of Germany must be removed. The fears of Great Britain and the dominions with reference to the seas in time of war must be overcome. Provision for the increasing population of Japan must be made. For the decision of such matters formulas must be found, accepted, and lived up to. These are matters of international morals. We have already referred to the address by Colonel Noblemaire, of France. This soldier and business man said other things. We quote:

Gentlemen, I took part in the war. I saw men killed. I sent men to death when it was my duty. But there are beautiful things, even in war. Let me tell you of a young soldier, scarcely more than a child, who lay dying on a stretcher. When I asked him what was the last word I could take to his family, whom I knew, he said: "Tell mother for me, Long live France," and he died.

And such incidents took place on both sides. How many German heroes said, "Tell mother for me, Long live Germany." And why should not the hopes of those heroes—for both were heroes—be realized? Why cannot France and Germany live side by side in peace and prosperity? That is what the whole pacific and industrious French people desire.

But, peaceable as we are, we are not blind Pacifists. We will not be deaf to sounds of wars and dangers about us. Those Pacifists who would blindly strip their countries' defenses lead their people not to the millennium, but to the slaughter-house. France wants the reparations and security promised her in the peace treaty. But as yet we do not see security completed. Conditions now are better than they were yesterday, but we want them still better tomorrow.

German material disarmament is nearly completed, but the non-possibility of re-armament is no less essential. What is the use of destroying obsolete weapons if you leave the

opportunity to make more modern weapons? We want moral disarmament, and the world wants moral disarmament. Without that, material disarmament is a snare and delusion.

PASSPORTS AS A MEANS OF GRACE

THE STYLE in passports, unlike certain other styles, is set in Washington. One outstanding fact about these creations is that they cost just now \$10 in American money. Of course, this refers to only the bare bones of the things, naked and unadorned. When fully trimmed, the cost is sometimes staggering. Each adornment is liable to cost \$10 in itself. The prospective voyager gets the precious original, pays the equivalent of 1,250 marks, and, if he be but a beginner in the fine art of traveling, he is all unconscious of the fact that his troubles have just begun. The United States not only charges \$10 for the framework; it charges \$10 for each separate trimming, commonly called a visé. The other nations looking on, believing in the justice of the principle of reciprocity, raise their visés accordingly, with the result that traveling has become a luxury only for the rich. It is a fact that the cost of visés for a journey from Paris to Constantinople is greater than the cost of a second-class railroad ticket between the same points. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Interparliamentary Union, meeting at Stockholm, saw fit to pay its respects to this situation by passing a formal resolution looking toward a restraint in this special realm of profiteering. An American business man recently returning to Berlin from Riga complains that trade with the Baltic States and with Russia is "exceedingly difficult" because of the passport regulations. It appears that the American authorities insisted on his delivering his passport to them before entering Russia, while the Soviet Government insisted that all Americans, including him, in order to receive protection, can enter Russia only with passports. This looks strangely like what might be called an impasse. A gentleman failed first to get a visé for certain Baltic States; whereupon the American consul at Riga refused to give the gentleman a visé to return to Germany, the Germans the while insisting that Americans must be granted visés by the American consul. Once again an impasse. It is not wholly without reason that the Baltic States have retaliated against America's ten-dollar passport law by each of them demanding a ten-dollar visé for American passports. But it is none the less embarrassing for the traveler to pay a grand total of \$40 in passport millinery if he wishes to travel from Berlin to Riga. It is interesting that the Poles insist on a visé for their "free city" of Danzig.

And yet there is an advantage in the new style. It promotes self-discipline. If a man succeeds in traveling

from the United States through Europe and in arriving again in his own country without irreparable injury to his immortal spirit, his status in the world hereafter need cause him little concern. *Sic eunt fata hominum*—just as if our souls were in need of more world circumstance to give them bent.

MAN'S FAITH IN HIS GOD

FAITH in a living God, sometimes in living gods, has been a prevailing characteristic of most human beings, at least since the beginnings of recorded history. When Aristotle taught that "God extends from eternity to eternity," he was expressing a faith that had persisted throughout the centuries before. When Napoleon remarked that "all things proclaim the existence of God," he echoed something out of an utterance of that other and more ancient asseveration by Hannibal, that "it is impossible to do anything against the will of God."

And yet this faith has never endured unchallenged. Controversy has met it at every turn throughout the ages. Perhaps the divergency of views has never been more clearly stated than by Voltaire, of whom the Right Honorable John Morley wrote in 1872: "Voltaire's work from first to last was alert with unquenchable fire." Among the "Miscellaneous Papers" of this Parisian wit, poet, and historian, arch foe of intolerance and fanaticism, he has some remarks "On the Existence of God." Aiming, as he says, to divest himself of all passion and prejudice, he sets forth to treat the theme in the spirit of reason. He begins by pointing out that there are peoples who have no knowledge of a creator. He goes on to point out that children have no native conception of God, and that among adults the ideas of God are far from uniform. Granting that there seems to be an order and a purpose in the universe, this justifies us in concluding simply that "it is probable that an intelligent and superior being has skillfully prepared and fashioned the matter." In other words, it all "simply means that there is something more powerful than I, and beyond this, nothing."

He then goes on to give a synopsis of the metaphysical argument for the existence of a God, an argument familiar in his day, a thesis which he grants "leads to much vaster conceptions." This metaphysical argument he finds rests upon the fact of existence. If something exists, it exists either of itself or it has received its being from another. In either event, there must have been a creator, hence a God, a being which has existed necessarily through himself from eternity and who has originated all other beings, himself infinite in duration, immensity, and power. But he proceeds to summarize the objections which can be raised to any

argument for the existence of a God, such as the incredibility of a system created out of nothing, of a being infinitely wise existing through an eternity preceding creation without making the least use of his power, of a God infinitely good creating life so filled with manifest infinite miseries.

Just now the controversy has been brought afresh to our attention by twenty-one Chinese students now in this country, students who are asking certain questions about America's faith in God. The questions have been addressed to a thousand Americans of different professional and occupational classes. The questions were: (1) What is your idea of God? (2) Do you believe in God? (3) Why?

President W. H. P. Faunce, of Brown University, one of the eminent men questioned, with his characteristic lucidity of expression, answered in a way that, we believe, voices substantially the best thought of the majority of men. He said:

"1. My idea of God is an idea and not an image. He cannot be painted or carved, since God is spirit and not body. He is like our human spirits—invisible to eyes of flesh, but conscious and personal. God must be like the highest we know, which is personality. If He is not like wood or stone, so He is not like blind, unconscious energy. He is like the purest spirits we have ever known, 'like as a Father,' like the saints and heroes of history, only infinitely beyond and above them. They are fragments of personality; He is the one fully realized Person. His infinite spirit, pervading all time and space, sleeps in matter, wakes in mind, and reveals itself supremely in Jesus of Nazareth.

"2. In such a God I believe, because without Him nothing can be explained. Unless behind the stars there is intelligence, it is useless for intelligent men to study them. But the deeper we go into nature, the more clearly we perceive intelligence, adaptation, wisdom. And the more deeply we study the souls of men or our own souls, the more clearly we perceive the image and superscription of God. To live deeply is to have experience of God.

"3. I believe in such a God because otherwise I could not believe in anything, but should be an absolute skeptic. If I did not believe in God I could not believe in any permanent laws of nature or any abiding virtue in men. It is either God or chance and chaos; either a spirit at the heart of the universe or no spirit anywhere, no duty, no truth, no law, no life. Since God explains all things, He Himself cannot be explained. He can only be worshiped, trusted, used each day by His children."

THREE IS LEAVEN in the loaf. "Plans for a world federation of engineers, designed primarily to work for international peace," were the words which headed the announcement of the dinner arranged by the Federated American Engineering Societies, under